

Interagency Vegetation Working Group

Dec. 6, 2001

- Focus on “natural” veg. Classification systems (floristics, composition, structure, dominant species, etc.)
- Discuss Land Cover/Use and Mapping stds. At next mtg.
- Build “common” Framework/System for agencies to X-walk to . . . (including assumptions/logic used in each diff. Class. System)
- Need to tie to WHR . . . to meet State business needs
- What “raw material” do we need to meet business needs?
- Process for review of draft material?
 - Larger groups for informal review
 - Segue to more formal review process . . .
- Long-term funding proposal

Website Materials (for CBC web mgr.)

1. Veg. MOU
2. Mtg. minutes
3. FGDC stds.
4. TNC stds.
5. Agency source materials
6. Related links

Process: Mark as the “editor” along with a core group to review web materials

- Ralph W.

Classification Review

NVCS document – on NatureServe website

See Todd’s summary sheet showing Level, Primary Basis for Classification, and Example; and definition of some terms

- what’s defined and what’s not defined by NVCS?
- work is in-progress, both from top-down and bottom-up
- what guidance do we provide: match env. conditions and species composition
- Need one more grouping above alliance level in FGDC classification: see Todd’s “Ecological groups” example (Plant Communities of the MidWest)
- Map “clusters” (nesting) of associations
- USFS – “Uniform” type example

Common “denominators”/attributes to meet just about any classification system (preferably related to California business needs):

- *Next mtg.*

- *given the flux in the national system, can we develop a strategy for capturing the most important attributes for California needs?*
- NPS, DFG have somewhat “ignored” formation level

Land Cover/Use Classification – where are overlaps and rules for breaks between Natural Veg. And land cover (see Molly’s example X-walk)

Classification Systems:

1. USFS – CALVEG (see Draft document: “Field Keys & Descriptions to CALVEG Alliances”) – Dominance Type (“from above”) system; life-form, conifers, hardwoods, shrub/subshrubs, grasses and forbes, and non-vegetated type keys; see separate X-walk to WHR; no 25% break std. Between shrub steps and grasses (but no major diff. From national stds.)
2. Wildlife Habitat Relationships (WHR) – primary purpose was to map wildlife species distribution; lifeform types; aquatic types; ag. And developed types; a few “geographic” references remain in classification system; MMU of 40 acres – “rule of thumb”
3. NDDDB/WHDB’s melded with NVCS to create a State Veg. Classification – evolved from Holland, et al. and interjected assoc./alliances from Calif. Manual; (see Todd’s example: Forest); based on sample plot data; peer reviewed by ABI/NatureServe; (Note: Manual of California Vegetation is being reviewed by veg. Experts during 5 workshops across the State; trying to standardize on “old” version of NVCS)

What business needs are not met by each classification system?:

Next Mtg.:

Finish a Draft List of Common Attributes
Non-Veg. Classification System
Map Unit Design

9 am to Noon, Feb. 20, 2002